

A Full  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
Second Defence

Of the Exposition of the Doctrin of the  
CHURCH of ENGLAND.  
IN A  
Letter to the Defender.



SIR,



When I first saw your Book, I was presently induced to judge either that my Printer had betray'd my Sheets in the Press, or that what you say you have some reason to believe of mine, was more true concerning yours, that you were not the only person concerned in this *second Defence*. But when I came to peruse it, I must confess I was presently convinced that I had made a rash judgment, and do therefore here retract it, and acknowledge that I believe you are the only Author, and that you did not get my Book till about the time it was made public. But this does not hinder but that another conjecture of mine may be true; that not only several materials were formerly gathered, by your self or others, for this Building, (the the over-

over-hasty joyning them together has not contributed to the solidity of the Work, but that some parts of it also might have been written by prevention, or brought in from some other Discourses, they are so little to the purpose.

However, Sir, if you assure me to the contrary, I will believe you so far as to retract this also, and allow that the whole was written not only by *yourself*, but with *that speed* which your Party takes care to boast of.

And now that the Work is out, an Answer is expected from me; but either *You*, or *your Friends* for you, think that a years time will be little enough for the Bishop of Condom and my self to put words together. Indeed if I would take notice of those who only put words together, and trouble my self to answer all your bold Assertions, unproved Conjectures, and (I must still use the word) *unjust Calumnies*, a years time might easily be cast away in such triflings.

But, Sir, I here declare once for all, that as I intend to pass over all those things which bear not the face of an Argument, tho' perhaps they may be witty contents; so am I resolved not to let any of your pretended proofs escape, or any thing that looks like a solid Answer pass unsatisfied.

In pursuit of this intention, I come to your

#### TITLE-PAGE;

Which tells us, indeed, that the Book is *A Defence of the Exposition against the new Exceptions of the Vindictor*: But they who peruse the Work it self, will find that it ought rather to be called *A free Confession of the matter of Fact in all those Exceptions*. From thence I pass over your *Dedication*, because it is only words put together, without any one Argument, and come to your

#### PREFACE.

This seems to have been composed by advance, it takes so little notice of the necessary distinctions I have laid down in my *Reply*. You usher it in with a complaint of an ancient Father against a Heathen Philosopher, and take the liberty to apply it to us; but they who consider things aright, will find the Garment fits more closely upon others, and therefore does more properly belong to them.

This



This Calumny is backed with an *Historical Vindication*, as you call it, of the distinction of *Old and New Popery*. Here I expected some great performance, which you took so much care to preadmonish your Readers of in the Title-page and Table. But when I came to examin it, I found nothing in it to the purpose. You have amassed indeed some stories of New Converts, who had been deceived by the like *Misrepresentations* which we so justly complain of; And other Hypocrits, (if what you relate of them be just) who continued to think them true. And if this be the way of giving Historical Accounts, you had best set up next time for an *Historiographer*, which will become you better than a *Controversist*; you have Friends enough to furnish you with materials, but for your credit-sake examine the truth of them, and apply them to some better purpose. First, you tell us that Monsiear Brucys, who acknowledg'd himself to have received a great part, if not his whole satisfaction, from *M. de Meaux Exposition*, exhorted the Protestants to return from their odious Separation, because Reason, Charity, the Glory of God, the peace of the Church, the good of the State, the interest of their Salvation required that at this time they should return from that odious separation, by putting matters into the same state in which they were before; and that the way was facilitated because it was to be sincerely acknowledged the Doctrine and Worship of the Roman Church was never so clearly (not cleanly, as you designedly render it) expounded as in our days; and that he could not but think that if their Forefathers had believed things to be as in effect they were, and are now proposed, they would never have separated from its Communion. Now, for my part, I stand in need of your spectacles, Sir, to see how this proves that there was a *New and Old Popery* any where but in the conceit of our Adversaries, their Forefathers as he calls them; especially seeing he invites them to put things into a state in which they were before, and tells them that in reality they are what they are represented. But, it seems, to praise the Bishop of Condom for expounding our Doctrins and Practices more clearly and intelligibly than others had done before him, is with our new Masters of Expression to confess that he introduced a *New Popery*.

Nettement  
Un discours  
net; that  
is, A clear  
and intelli-  
gible Dis-  
course.

Secondly, Ba. Crasset is again brought upon the Stage for defending what he himself does not acknowledge to be an Article

Page v.

of our Faith, and therefore belongs not to what you call *Popery* at all. If therefore you took from thence an occasion to make that odious distinction of *New and Old Popery*, it was without any just reason, and you ought to recall it.

Page vi.

*Thirdly*, you subjoin a Letter written by Monsieur *Ranchin*, an eminent *Convert*, as you call him, upon his change, who tells you of a Faith practised by the *People and the Tartuffs*, different from that of the Bishop of *Condom's Exposition* and the *Wholsom Advice*: But you have shewn (if what you affirm from the Author's Dialogue be true) of what credit such a persons Authority is, who weighed things so little, as to sell his Religion for Money and Preferments.

Page ix.

*Fourthly*, you give us such another account of one Monsieur *Pawlet*, a Minister, who made his *Conscience* comply to his *Interest*; a fit man to be brought in as one of your Witnesses for such an odious Accusation.

*Fifthly*, After this the Inhabitants of *Montauban* are called; who acknowledged that the *Abuses which were imputed to the Church*, were not sufficient to oblige their *Ancestors* to separate from it; but yet desired leave to make *Remonstrances* to the *Clergy* to purge the *Roman Church* of many *Abuses*; which was granted them. This shews, indeed, that *They* were more moderate than *You*, but is not a very convincing proof that there was truly an *Old and New Popery*, excepting in their Imaginations.

Page ix.

*Sixthly*, Monsieur *Imbert's* Case is again brought up, both as an Instance of this *New and Old Popery*; and to shew that you did neither falsifie nor calumniate when you translated these words; *Ecce lignum Crucis, in quo pependit salus mundi; venite Adoremus: Behold the wood of the Cross; come let us adore It*: instead of, *Behold the wood of the Cross, on which the Savior of the World did hang; come let us adore*. As for Monsieur *Imbert's* Case, which you give us only from his own *Factum*, (upon which you know a Sentence cannot be pronounced till his adverse party have put in their Reply) I neither know it, nor am I concern'd to enquire into it. But the severe Reflections which you make, and that justly enough, against the proceeding of his *Diocesan*, and the Crimes he must be guilty of, if *Imbert* said the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth, will make unbiassed persons think that this *Imbert* (who was more cautious than to accuse himself



himself in his own Bill) was not just in the delivery of the matter of Fact, nor faithful when he said he was accused only for conforming to the Bishop of Condom's *Exposition*. The Bishop tells us of Extravagances committed in the Church, and I suppose, if it were worth while, he could prove them to you. And as to the false Translation, it is so manifest, that I need not make any more words of it; and if the Curate cry'd out, as *Imbert* accuses him, *the wood, the wood*, he was as much in the wrong as your self.

Lastly, you bring in the Titles of several Sections in the *Wholsom Advices of the Blessed Virgin to her indiscreet Worshippers*. Page xi.

Now indeed, Sir, if any of those Practices against which he gives those Admonitions had been established by the Church in the foregoing Ages as Articles of her Faith, and now only condemn'd by us, you would have had some reason to make your distinction of *New and Old Popery*, but not otherwise. This you foresaw, and therefore wisely prevent my telling you, that *if any of those Extravagances have been practis'd, the Church is not to answer for them*; seeing (I will add) she has always taken care to instruct them better. And as for your very scandalous insinuation (pardon me, Sir, you know 'tis such) that *it was no longer ago than in the year 1679, that it was thought a Crime to be condemn'd not only by the Pope and the King, but by the Learned of all Nations, a Crime worthy of Banishment in this Life, and of Damnation in the other, but only to advise them better*. You have given us in another place, it may be thro' forgetfulness, a short Answer to it; *They who oppose that Book of Wholsom Advices, are not therefore Enemies to every one of those particulars.* 2 Def. p. 24

Thus much for the first part of your Preface.

The second is an Enquiry, *What the thing called the Churches sense is, and how we may come to the knowledge of it?* Pref. p. xii. To pass by your ushering this Question in with the foregoing false and malicious insinuation, which you your self knew to be so, as I have prov'd; I shall, tho' it has been done fully in my *Reply*, and elsewhere, yet condescend once more to answer both the Questions.

First, the *Churches sense* in our case is that which she delivers as a *Doctrine of Faith*, or a *necessary Practice*: I say, as a *Doctrine of Faith*, that is, a *Doctrine* deliver'd down by an uninterrupted Tradition from authoris'd Pastors to authoris'd Pastors; which whosoever renounces, is justly cut off from being a Member of her.

her Communion: I say also, *necessary Practices*, that is, such as she obliges all her Children to do, and condemns those that refuse, as Schismatics.

*Secondly*, to know how you may come to the *knowledge of this sense*: I answer, by the voice of the Church, in her General and approved Councils; and by her universally practising such things as necessary.

Till therefore you can prove by the express words of a General approved Council, or by the Universal Practice of the Church, that what you term *Old Popery*, was deliver'd as a Doctrine of Faith, or a Practice necessary to Salvation; all you say will avail you nothing; for you bring only the private sentiments of men, which other Members of the same Church condemn; and so long as there is such a Dispute betwixt them whom she acknowledges to be her Children, and she does not determin it, any one may hold which side they please, as an Opinion; or suspend their Judgment: but neither side is truly what you ought to mean by *Popery*.

Page xiii.

Thus, Sir, unless you prove directly from our General and received Councils, that we require *other aid and assistance* from the Saints than their *Prayers*, or that which God shall permit or command them to give, as Ministering Spirits, you say nothing against Us, or the lawfulness of what We practise. Thus also, unless you can shew that a General Council positively declares that it is lawful to *implore the aid of Monuments, or Sacred Reliques*; if you affirm that we believe it, you are a *Misrepresenter*. But, Sir, all the little tricks you have will never prove this, nor will you, whilst you continue to justify your Crime, ever pass amongst men that examine things, for other than a *false Translation* of the words of the Council of *Trent* upon this point. The art you think to elude it by, because people go to these Sacred Monuments and Reliques, to receive Benefit, (and the *Representer* as you say acknowledges it) will not justify your Translation, unless you prove that when they come there they *pray to them*, (those Monuments or Reliques) instead of desiring the *Saints*, whose they are, to *pray for them*.

Page xiv.

Moreover, if you accuse us of paying *Divine Worship* to *Stocks* and *Stones*, to *Images* and *Crucifixes*; unless you can shew us that some of our General approved Councils have positively defined this,

this, or our Universal Practice necessarily establish it, you are still a *Dispresenter* and a *Calumniator*, too. But, Sir, tho' the Council of Trent affirm that the *Honor and Veneration* is to be given them, yet it does not follow that it is the Honor due to God which is the meant, tho' I am certainly inform'd this has been deliver'd in some Pulpits (I do not speak of yours, Sir,) to the scandal of those who examin'd the following words in that Council. And tho' Cardinal *Gaspacchi* and others think that the Cross of Christ, as in its representative Nature, one with him whom it represents, is to be worshiped with the same Worship as Christ himself; as the Garments of a King with the King, without any reflective distinction: yet seeing others of the same Communion reject this, and are not censur'd by the Church, it plainly follows that this is no necessary Doctrine of our Church. And therefore whoever calls this *Old Popery*, is a *Dispresenter*, a *Falsifier*, and a *Calumniator*.

What I have said in this case, is applicable to all others. And tho' you may think you have sufficiently prov'd your Assertion by affirming that *as we ought not to judge of the Pagan Religion from the Imperinency of their Poets, or the Specious Discourses of the Philosophers, but from the Worship that was practis'd by public Authority; so ought we not to judge of the Doctrins of the Church of Rome by the singular Notions of some private men, (tho' pretending to deliver nothing but the Churches sense) but by her Universal Practice.* Yet, tho' I admit the Parallel, I am certain it will never make any thing for you, till you can shew that the Church does or did make use of Racks and Gibbets, and all sorts of Tortures, to oblige people to believe and practise those things which you call *Old Popery*; as the Heathens did to make them worship Idols, &c. Or that she does allow such wicked Practices as correspond to your Author's Example of *Killing and Robbing*, and are as dangerous to the Church, as those are to a State. But you know, Sir, it is impossible to prove either of these; and every thing, I hope, that any one fancies to be ill, is not therefore to be reprov'd.

Thus much, Sir, to your Preface; now to your

B. O. O. K.

In *It*, after some few pages as an *Introduction*, you send an *Address* to the Bishop of Meaux: but seeing in the beginning of it you question either my *abilities* or my *sincerity* in delivering a right

Pref. p. xviii.

Pag. xx.

right interpretation of it; I shall refer that part to your self, and if you desire any Answer from him, be you your own Interpreter, and then I hope there will be no mistakes.

Passing over therefore all the Letter, which concerns not me, nor the *Doctrin of the Catholic Church* which I am to vindicate, I come to your

*Second Section*

Pag. 45.

In which I perceive nothing but *Passion*, and that to such a degree, that it has very much perverted your *Judgment*; for whilst you pretend to vindicate your self from what you call *false Imputations*, you confess the Fact; and whilst you accuse me of horrid Crimes, you with the same breath pronounce *your self* guilty of them.

In the Table

First, you affirm, that the *Principles of many of the Casuists of the Roman Church do allow the defaming of an Adversary by such Accusations as they know to be false*. But this, Sir, as you here word it, is a false imputation.

Pag. 51.

*False*, I say; for you have not brought one that allows it. You tell us indeed that some have maintain'd it in their public Acts to be but a *venial sin* in some cases; But if you understood our Maxim, that *no evil is to be done that good may come of it*, and that if a Venial Sin would save a Nation, nay the World itself, from being destroyed, it is so far from being lawful to commit it, that we ought to perish rather than to do it; you would not have concluded from thence that such Casuists allow the *defaming of an Adversary*.

2 Def. p. 51.

But I positively denyed your Assertion, and you now prove it. In general, Sir, I grant, and that may be I hope without being obliged to deny every part of it, it was sufficient that the first part was absolutely false, viz. that *some men do think that any thing may be done against an Heretic*. This is indeed a *Doctrin* I have heard some *Roman Catholics* accused of; but, as I then said, I have always found the Calumny stand at the Accusers door. If other persons have held *Lying* and *Calumny* only a Venial Sin, their Position did not affect the Church, and it has been justly condemn'd (as you acknowledge) by the Supreme Pastor of it.

Pag. 54.

Secondly, your next progress is to shew that you have just cause to believe that I have proceeded according to these Principles, from four Heads: Of every one of which you are far more guilty



guilty your self than I; and therefore you give me just reason to retort the Argument.

The first Head is, *From the Accusations themselves*, of which you give several Instances by way of Specimen, that is of *Obliging Titles* which you say I bestow upon you. But in this I assure you, Sir, you exceed me far; and, would I take the pains to sum up what you have industriously expressed in this kind only, in the three foregoing leaves of this your second Defence, the World would see that you are more delighted with those *strains of Rhetoric* than my self. Page 34.  
From pag. 49, to 54.

Secondly, From laying hold on the *lightest* and most *pitiful occasions* to run out into the most *grievous Accusations* against you. But, Sir, will you call those *pitiful light things*, which you made so much use of, as to draw an Argument from them. I assure you, Sir, if you had not vary'd your Character in your *We suppose*, and formed an Argument from it of our want of proof, I should not have call'd it what you see you cannot now deny it was, a *Falsification*. And as for the other, if you know not how any thing can be offered in a true and proper Sacrifice, without being offered up to death, you should have argued so, and not have told us that the Bishop of Meaux observed that St. Paul concluded that Christ himself ought not to be any more offered, without putting in the following words, *up to death for us*. Page 36.

These are the only two you could pitch upon as *light* and *trifling*; and you conclude from thence that I have a *Calumniating Spirit*. But let any one be Judge betwixt You and Me. You accuse the *Translator* of the Bp's Letter (for this indeed was not my own) of above a dozen mistakes in that Translation, and have taken care to mark them in the Bishop's Letter; but any one will see that the sense has not at all been perverted in those places, nor any Argument so much as pretended to be drawn from them; nay, the very first you have challeng'd me with, is your own mistake; for the words, *Mais quand j'aurai adjointe des Cartons a une Impression deja faite*, are not literally as your nor my Translation, but this: *What if I had added some leaves to an Impression already finished?* And therefore, if your consequence against me be good, your Accusations were guided by such a Spirit as that which you so freely accuse me of. Page 32.

Thirdly, you say I bring such *Allegations* as I could never be sure were true; and this because I could not dive into your thoughts. I shall say nothing to this, but that if you would not give others

leave to judge of your intention by your outward Actions, you should not take the liberty your self, nor in your

Page 61.

*Fourth Reason* tell me that I accuse you of such things as I certainly knew were false. It seems you have some *Enthusiastic Spirit*, or some *Hypochondriac Lady*, (a Mrs. James, perhaps) to deliver Oracles of this nature to you, tho' we have none.

See the Letter to the Author of the Discourse concerning Extreme Unction.

For my own part, I declare in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of hearts, and avenger of all wilful crimes, that I never accused you of any thing, but what I thought (nay have prov'd) you evidently guilty of; and I think I have now satisfied the world, that in the very instance you now bring you are what I affirm'd you to be, a *Falsifier*. And, were it not that I fear to increase your guilt, I would challenge you (if you dare speak truth) to deny positively that you were not satisfied to the contrary in those very things upon which I had occasion to appeal to your Knowledge or your Conscience.

Page 66.

Your second part of this Section is taken up with a Refutation, as you call it, of two points.

1. Of those *scandalous Reflections*, which you say I have cast upon the generality of the Church of England.

2. Of those *Imputations* I have laid upon your self in particular.

1. As to the first part, I refer you for the proof of whatever I have said, to a late Book called *Good Advice to the Pulpits*, which is alone enough to make your Party ashamed, if they have any sense of Honor or Conscience in them. And yet I might wish you to remember the Misrepresentations of our Doctrine, which have been thunder'd from the Pulpits into the Peoples ears, and inserted into your Writings, ever since your pretended *Reformation*; some of which (for it is impossible to give them all) have been noted by the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, the *Acts of the General Assembly of the French Clergy*, and others. And till we see your Party repent, and make some satisfaction, we shall have reason to accuse them of persisting in *Calumnies, Misrepresentations, Falsifications, &c.* to serve a turn.

Page 76, 77.

I might pass to the next, but that I find you call Dr. Heylin's account of the bitter Revilings in Qu. Eliz. time to secure her Title, and Archbishop Laud's Moderation in hindring such things from being Re-printed, a very dangerous story; and my charitable Admonitions that you would not upon any politic design keep our bleeding Divisions open, to the ruin both of Church and State, as dangerous insinuations: whereas I see no such danger in them, unless you esteem

it a *dangerous insinuation* to shew that your Party have upon all occasions clapt a deform'd Vizard upon us, which when once detected, will certainly redound to your own Confusion. You may make them seem dangerous, by misrepresenting them, and drawing ill consequences from your own Misrepresentations. I suppose no one will deny, but that these brangles about Religion, many of which might be ended, if some hot-headed Spirits did not augment them, are no great benefit either to Church or State; and this was the plain English of my expressions, and all that can be rationally deduced from my words. But a Cavilling and Calumniating Spirit can draw ill consequences out of any thing.

II. And now, *Sir*, I come to those *Imputations* which you say I have unjustly laid upon you. But how have you clear'd your self?

As to, *first*, the *hard names* I gave you, and *secondly*, the *wilful faults* I laid to your charge, I have already answer'd you. Page 72.

3. If I reflected upon your *Preaching*, it was from meer report; for I assure you, *Sir*, what you were told of my being sometimes a part of your *Auditory*, is like many other stories which you abound with in all your Writings. I suppose too from hear-say. Of this nature is your other also of my *critical Sunday night Conference*, where your *Sermons* have been sometimes (if you be rightly inform'd) put upon the Rack by me. But, *Sir*, if you had never told your Auditors from the Pulpit, that we give *Divine Worship* to *Saints*, I suppose you would have denied the Charge. And if your Conscience tell you that you did, ask that Conscience, Whether *We*, who acknowledg only *One God* whom we must adore, can be guilty of such a horrid Crime?

As for calling your *Auditory Learned*, I suppose, tho' some of them might truly deserve that Character, yet they did not all; And we know that it is these later sort that take all things as Truths which flow from an Eloquent Preacher's mouth.

4. You promise great matters in answer to those *Calumnies*, *Falsifications*, &c. which I have justly charg'd you with; but if you have no better success in the following part of this Defence, than you have had in this first, you had better give the Cause up, which you shew cannot be justly managed. Page 32.

5. The *ill language* I charg'd you with, you cannot deny; nay, which is worse, you justify it, and that in the worst sense too. Page 33.

How you have treated the B. of *Menax*, appears plain enough by your believing every *idle Report* rather than his *Pindication*, and if the term *Railery*, which I made use of, was too soft for

your

your expressions, call them *passions*, if you please; you calling *St. Thomas's* Opinions, or his proofs of them, *passions* in the worst sense, that is, downright *Calumnies*: *St. Bernard's*, *Abelard's*, the Abbot of *Clugny*, *St. Anselm's*, *St. Bernard's*, and even the devout *St. Bernard's* Expressions, being thus made up, and your vindicating the Charge when you have done, and yet pretending that *no one is so scrupulously careful to avoid all language as your self*, shews indeed such a new kind of scrupulous Caution, as I have seldom met with.

Had you only said that *Fa. Crasset* had collected such passages from those great Saints, as, if taken in that strict and dogmatical sense he brought them for, might be called *Blasphemies*; that *Fa. holy Saints* charges, to call them *Superstitious men*, their Expressions *vain and extravagant*, say horrid *Blasphemies*, and such as proceeded from an *indiscreet Zeal*, &c. is what truly pious ears cannot hear without indignation.

*Lastly*, as to your calling the pious and significant Ceremonies of the Church *Magical Incantations*; had I not intimated to you that you your selves use such-like Prayers and Ceremonies in the Consecration of bread and *Wine* too, in the *Mass* of the *Eucharist*, and that *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Basil* speak against the Catholic Church would have had more force. But seeing you your selves are accus'd for setting Persons and Places apart for the Service of our Maker by Prayer and Ceremony, and thus you think the charge unjust; why is it not also an unjust charge against us, to call our setting things apart by the like Ceremonies, *Magical Incantations*?

Your third Section is taken up in giving us a Catalogue of Books recommended; but you should first have told us whether they were worth answering in particular or no; when all that is said in them is copied in many Treatises. There are several *Manuscripts* of ours which remain *unanswered*; the *Guide* is such bold assertions attack upon us as has attack'd the *other Discourses* of the same Author lately published at *Oxford*, with the like misfortune.

And now, Sir, having pass'd thro' this your pretended *Defense*, I think I have great reason to give you thanks for it, seeing you have been so far from answering any thing I have said, that you have *justified my accusation*. I should not have thought it *convenient*, much less *necessary*, to make these *Reflections*, but that seeing you are pleas'd to promise *an Answer to the ensuing part of my Reply*, I would willingly have it done in such a manner, that if you have any Reason for your *separations*, we might not be put off with *Tricks*. Pray therefore, good Sir, make not so much *noise* in your *next*, but weigh your arguments well, if you have any; and let us not have *Saddening* instead of *Rejoicing*, nor *Phonies* and *spiritual* of *Reason*. I am,

Sir, Your humble Servant.

London: Printed by Henry Hills, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for His Household and Chappel; And are to be sold at his Printing-house on the Ditch-side in *Black-Fryer*. 1687.



Page 35.

See the Form of consecrating a Ch. or Chappel, Sparrow's Can. p. 175.

1687